

Under existing law, Congress would have 60 days to consider the agreement, an important provision given that the agreement before us is complex and requires time for hearings and debate. But because there is little time left on the legislative calendar, we're forced to vote to waive the consultation period and consider the agreement today without the benefit of sufficient review. The bill is also being considered under suspension of the rules, which provides for only limited debate and no amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I am uncomfortable with this process. I am also disappointed that the legislation does not resolve what appear to be conflicting interpretations between U.S. officials and Indian officials about key points of the agreement. But I do believe that ultimately this agreement will help bring India closer to the global nonproliferation regime—a better outcome than if we leave it on the outside. And for that reason, I will support this legislation today.

In exchange for getting access to sensitive nuclear technology and fuel supplies, India has committed to continue its moratorium on nuclear weapons testing; separate its civilian and military nuclear programs; place all current and future civil nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards; implement a strong national export control system; work with the U.S. to conclude a multilateral Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty; and not transfer nuclear technologies to states that do not already possess them. Although the agreement does not specifically require the U.S. to cut off nuclear cooperation if India tests another weapon or violates the IAEA safeguards, Secretary Rice has promised that the “deal . . . would at that point be off.” I have no doubt that an Obama or McCain administration would follow that same course. I have confidence that as a strong democracy and a responsible actor on the world stage, India will abide by its commitments—but I also take comfort in the agreement's stipulations that we can terminate the agreement and seek the return of any transferred materials and technology should circumstances require such a step.

So in conclusion, I believe this agreement strikes the right balance between strengthening our relationship with India and also maintaining our robust and time-tested international nuclear nonproliferation regime. I will support the bill today, but I plan to carefully scrutinize the agreement's implementation to ensure that India is abiding by its commitments.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JERRY WELLER AND THE HON- ORABLE RAY LAHOOD

SPEECH OF

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 25, 2008

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the distinguished career of JERRY WELLER, who will be retiring at the end of the 110th Congress. I wish to express my appreciation for his service to our country and the state of Illinois.

JERRY was elected to Congress in 1994 as the representative of the 11th District of Illinois. He began his public service career working as a Congressional and Administration aide, followed by three terms in the Illinois General Assembly. He has used his seat on the Ways and Means Committee to make a strong, positive difference for families in Illinois and throughout the United States.

JERRY has worked on a number of initiatives important to Illinois' families, including his efforts to enhance Illinois' infrastructure, establish and expand veterans' outpatient clinics, and protect children from on-line predators. JERRY was instrumental in passing legislation to redevelop the Joliet Arsenal in 1995, which created thousands of union jobs by establishing North America's largest intermodal truck, rail, and freight facility. He is a tireless advocate for the needs of his constituents and his country.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in an expression of appreciation to Congressman WELLER for his years of dedicated service to this body and to the people of Illinois. I wish JERRY and his family the very best in the future.

SUPPORTING RESTITUTION FOR PROPERTY CONFISCATED BY NAZI AND COMMUNIST REGIMES

SPEECH OF

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2008

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 371 which strongly supports and immediate and just restitution of, or compensation for, property illegally confiscated during the last century by Nazi and Communist regimes. As a cosponsor of this important resolution, I believe that while we must recognize steps forward, countries in central and eastern Europe that have not already done so must return confiscated properties to their rightful owners or, where restitution is not possible, pay equitable compensation.

In that vein, I would like to draw the attention of the House to one particular situation in Hungary. Since the end of the Cold War, Hungary has developed into a vibrant democracy, a member of the European Union, an important NATO ally, and a key friend of the United States.

Yet, even with this great progress, Hungary's record on restitution for Holocaust victims is mixed, at best. Take the case of Martha Nierenberg, an 84-year-old U.S. citizen who lives in New York State. Her grandfather amassed one of the preeminent art collections in Hungary, consisting of some 2,500 paintings. After the Nazis occupied Hungary, some of those paintings were personally seized by Adolf Eichmann, the infamous implementer of the Final Solution, for shipment to Nazi Germany. Others were taken by the Hungarian government in collaboration with the Nazis and wound up after World War II in state owned museums in Budapest.

Mrs. Nierenberg's mother began asking Hungary for the return of some of the paintings in 1996 and upon her mother's death, Mrs. Nierenberg began to request their return,

as well. Hungary refused to return the paintings, even though there has been no question that the paintings belonged to Mrs. Nierenberg's grandfather and to her mother after his death. As a result, Mrs. Nierenberg was forced to sue in Hungary for the return of 12 paintings. She won initially in the lower court (which returned one painting to her), but the Hungarian government challenged the ruling, requiring her to endure 7 years of appeals. She finally lost the final court case earlier this year, on technical grounds.

The Washington Principles adopted in 1998, and supported by the Hungarian government, require governments holding Holocaust property, such as Hungary, to arrive at a fair and equitable resolution of claims to the property. But, Hungary has not followed those principles and has not tried to reach a fair and equitable resolution of Mrs. Nierenberg's claims.

The appearance, sadly, is that the Hungarian government wants to “run the clock” on Mrs. Nierenberg, hoping that she will give up or die. But she will not give up, and Mrs. Nierenberg's children are as determined as she is to recover what is rightfully theirs.

What is most shocking to me about this case is how quickly countries are able to disassociate their war-time complicity in the Nazi Holocaust from their holding of the war-time booty. During World War II, Hungary expelled 440,000 Jews, most of whom perished in Auschwitz. Ironically, Adolph Eichmann, who stole some of the Nierenberg paintings, was chief of the team of “deportation experts” that helped the Hungarian authorities send their country's Jewish population to its demise.

Madam Speaker, Hungary has no moral claim to Mrs. Nierenberg's paintings and, should, at long last, do what is right. Therefore, as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 371, I urge the Hungarian government to return the paintings, at once, or work out a just resolution of this case with Mrs. Nierenberg in accordance with the Washington Principles.

BREAST CANCER PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 2008

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, H.R. 758, the “Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act”, would require that insurance companies cover a stay of at least 48 hours in the hospital for women undergoing mastectomy and other procedures when the physician, in consultation with the patient, deem them to be medically necessary.

This section of the bill was largely written to parallel section 2704 of the Public Health Service Act, Standards Relating to Benefits for Mothers and Newborns, which prevents drive through deliveries. Certain superfluous and unnecessary provisions, however, were deleted from H.R. 758 as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce on September 23, 2008, because the protections already exist in law.